

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

After the foregoing Amendment, claims 9-12, 14-16, 18-22, 24-26, 28-32, 34-36 and 38-57 are currently pending in this application. Claim 47 is currently amended. Claims 55-57 are newly added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 9-12, 14-16, 18-22, 24-26, 28-32, 34-36 and 38-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,150,361 to Wieczorek et al. (hereinafter Wieczorek) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,333,175 to Ariyavisitakul et al. (hereinafter Ariyavisitakul).

Claim 9 recites, in part, *wherein the plurality of circuit components are configured to operate in a first set of signal processing states associated with a first operating state, and in a second set of signal processing states associated with a second operating state, wherein the first set of signal processing states and the second set of signal processing states are different.* The Examiner states on page 2 of the Office Action that Applicants have failed “to clearly define ‘first set of signal processing states’ and second set of signal processing states’ in any of the pending claims.” Applicants respectfully disagree. The processing states are defined in claim 9 which recites a *plurality of circuit components wherein each of the plurality of circuit components is configured to operate in a first signal processing state...*, a

second signal processing state... and a third signal processing state...wherein the plurality of circuit components are configured to operate in a first set of signal processing states associated with a first operating state, and in a second set of signal processing states associated with a second operating state, wherein the first set of signal processing states and the second set of signal processing states are different (emphasis added). Thus, each circuit component operates in one of at least three *signal processing states* and the *signal processing states* of the *plurality of components* forms a *set of signal processing states* at a given time. When looking at the claim as a whole, claim 9 defines the *set of signal processing states* as a set comprising the signal processing states of *each of the plurality of circuit components*. There are at least two sets, each corresponding to *different...operating states*.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Wieczorek does not specifically disclose a *third signal processing state having an intermediate power consumption level*, and *wherein the plurality of circuit components are configured to operate in a first set of signal processing states associated with a first operating state, and in a second set of signal processing states associated with a second operating state, wherein the first set of signal processing states and the second set of signal processing states are different*, as claimed in claim 9. The Examiner relies on Ariyavisitakul as teaching this element.

The cited portions of Ariyavisitakul teach varying transmission power of a transmitter based on a received power control bit. In order to be receiving the power control bit in Ariyavisitakul, the portable unit must be actively receiving an analog signal. (See, e.g., column 16, lines 3-4 (noting that the power control bit is “transmitted with the burst”).) The cited portions of Ariyavisitakul therefore only disclose adjusting transmit power of the transmitter when the portable unit is actively receiving an analog signal. In other words, the portable unit of Ariyavisitakul is in a single, particular operating state while the power level varies depending on the value of the power control bit and the word error indicator. Thus, since Ariyavisitakul only teaches a single operating state, Ariyavisitakul cannot teach *wherein the plurality of circuit components are configured to operate in a first set of signal processing states associated with a first operating state, and in a second set of signal processing states associated with a second operating state, wherein the first set of signal processing states and the second set of signal processing states are different.* (Emphasis added) Assuming *arguendo* that the variable power states of the transmitter present in Ariyavisitakul are each a *signal processing state*, as claimed, there is no teaching in Ariyavisitakul that the claimed *operating state* of the portable unit changes.

Wieczorek and Ariyavisitakul, either separately or in combination, do not teach each and every element of claim 9. Applicant respectfully requests that the 103(a) rejection over claim 9 be withdrawn.

Claims 19 and 29 recite similar limitations to claim 9, and are therefore also patentable over Wieczorek and Ariyavisitakul, either alone or in combination. Claims 10-12, 14-16, 18, 20-22, 24-26, 28, 30-32, 34-36, and 38-54 depend from claims 9, 19, and 29.

Withdrawal of the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claims 9-12, 14-16, 18-22, 24-26, 28-32, 34-36 and 38-54 is requested.

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephonic interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaewell et al.

By /Robert D. Leonard/
Robert D. Leonard
Registration No. 57, 204

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4009
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499
RDL/dmc